



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/510,078 | 12/14/2004 | Mark Berman | JHN-267-88 | 4230 |
| 23117 7590 03/05/2009 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203 | | | | |
| EXAMINER PARK, EDWARD | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2624 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 03/05/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/510,078

Applicant(s)

BERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

EDWARD PARK

Art Unit

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) EDWARD PARK.(3) Jeffrey H Nelson (#30,481).(2) Yosef Kassa (Primary Examiner).(4) Rohan Wallace.

Date of Interview: 25 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 18-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Keshava et al ("Spectral Unmixing", IEEE Signal Processing Magazine), Sunshine et al (US 6,608,931 B2).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative and examiners discussed prior art reference in regards to claim 1. Examiners agreed that the newly proposed claim limitations in regards to claim 1, overcome the prior art of record. Furthermore, examiners agreed that claims 1, 18-20 overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101 with regards to the 101 Tied to criteria (transformation test).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/YOSEF KASSA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624